

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

This document responds to the Office Action dated March 18, 2010.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 23-37 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103 as supposedly being obvious in light of a two-way combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,290,056 to McLaughlin (hereafter “McLaughlin”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,233,585 to Gupta et. al. (hereafter “Gupta”). For the following reasons, the present application is distinguishable over these references.

**McLaughlin and Gupta cannot be consistently combined**

Assuming that, in general, when the terms used in the claims are read onto different references, then the terms must mean the same in both references. In the present case, combining the two references McLaughlin and Gupta requires different interpretations of the terms "client" and/or "server" and cannot be consistently combined.

Gupta and McLaughlin cannot be combined consistently, since:

- on the one hand, the Office Action states that McLaughlin discloses remote server and local server executing transactions (as cited by examiner: column 18, line 66; column 19, line 30).